

JOHN CHAFEE, having previously announced his plans to retire in the year 2000, we knew we would be missing his outstanding leadership. I join with my colleagues in extending our condolences and prayers to JOHN's widow Virginia and to his family and the many who admired JOHN CHAFEE's service to his nation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of four decades, JOHN H. CHAFEE has served the State of Rhode Island with distinction and honor. As State Representative, Governor, Secretary of the Navy and United States Senator, JOHN CHAFEE has set an unprecedented level of service having an impact on both his state and the nation. His absence will leave a void not only in Rhode Island but on the nation as a whole.

When the United States entered World War II, he left Yale to enlist in the Marine Corps, and then served in the original invasion force at Guadalcanal. He was recalled to active duty in 1951, and commanded a rifle company in Korea.

He served six years in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, where he was elected Minority Leader. Running for Governor in 1962, CHAFEE was elected by 398 votes. He was then reelected in 1964 and 1966—both times by the largest margin in the State's history. In January 1969, he was appointed Secretary of the Navy and served in that post for three-and-a-half years.

JOHN CHAFEE's Senate career began in 1976. He was reelected to a fourth term in 1994, with sixty-five percent of the vote, and is the only Republican to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Rhode Island in the past 68 years.

Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the Senator was a leading voice in crafting Clean Air Act of 1990 which strengthened pollution emissions legislation, and a bill to strengthen the Safe Drinking Water Act. Senator CHAFEE is a longtime advocate for wetland conservation and open space preservation, and has been the recipient of every major environmental award.

A senior member of the Finance Committee, Senator CHAFEE has worked successfully to expand health care coverage for women and children, and to improve community services for persons with disabilities. In 1990, Senator CHAFEE spearheaded the Republican Health Care Task Force and became a prominent figure in the national health reform debate. He went on to lead the bipartisan effort to craft a comprehensive health care reform proposal in 1994.

The Senator has received awards and endorsements from such organizations as The National Federation of Independent Business, The American Nurses Association, The League of Conservation Voters, The Sierra Club, Handgun Control Inc., Planned Parenthood, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National PTA.

Senator JOHN CHAFEE has approached his remarkable career with the single premise to operate through consensus and cooperation wherever possible in order to get the business of the people done. A Republican operating in a heavily Democratic state, Senator CHAFEE understood that partisanship had no place in politics. Today, I express my sincere sympathy to Senator CHAFEE's family, friends and the

great people of Rhode Island. America has lost a unique native son and a hero for us all to remember.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and all Rhode Islanders in mourning the untimely death of Senator CHAFEE.

The Senator was a principled voice who was able to work with both sides of the aisle on the issues close to his heart. He left a lasting imprint in our nation's laws—playing a key role in some of the most important legislation passed by Congress over the last three decades, especially in the areas of health care and the environment.

He proved that a sustained dedication to one's ideals through politics can make a real and lasting difference to our communities and our country. His retirement would have left a void in Congress; his untimely death leaves a void in the hearts of all who had the privilege of knowing and working with a true statesman and citizen.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Virginia Chafee and all the members of her family on the loss of her beloved husband, our esteemed colleague Senator JOHN H. CHAFEE.

Last night our nation lost a great American. JOHN CHAFEE saw combat service in both World War II and the Korean War. He served with distinction in the Rhode Island House of Representatives, as Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and as Secretary of the Navy. For the past 23 years, JOHN CHAFEE has served in the U.S. Senate where he was universally respected for his integrity, civility, and deeply held convictions.

Senator CHAFEE's contributions to our nation are many. His legacy includes a cleaner environment, better health care, and a model of true bipartisanship from which we can all learn.

I join in giving thanks for his life.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 344.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1987, FAIR ACCESS TO INDEMNITY AND REIMBURSEMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 106-414) on the resolution (H. Res. 342) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1987) to allow the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I joined the President and Health and Human Services Secretary Shalala today at the White House to call on Congress to approve a prescription drug benefit in Medicare. We also called on private health plans to continue providing coverage for medicine that doctors prescribe.

The problem is twofold. Millions of Americans, young and old, cannot afford the high costs of prescription drugs. And the majority in Congress refuse to lift a finger to reduce these prices and help protect public health.

Unlike other industrialized nations, the U.S. does not regulate drug prices. So drug companies charge us the highest prices of any nation by multiples of two and three and even four times what citizens in other countries pay.

Within the United States, drug companies are charging the highest prices to those with the least bargaining power, the elderly and those without health insurance. Drug companies are diverting also huge sums of money, money that comes from inflated drug prices, into advertising.

From a market perspective, drug companies are doing everything they should be doing. We cannot blame drug companies for maximizing their profits. They make more money than any other industry in America. That is their job. Nor can we blame the President and many of us in Congress for taking steps to protect seniors and the uninsured and to address the ramifications of what drug companies are doing to the disadvantaged. That is our job.

I have introduced an initiative that would bring down prices without taking away the industry's incentive to act like an industry. My bill promotes good old-fashioned American competition.

The Affordable Prescription Drug Act, H.R. 2927, does not use price controls or regulations to bring down prescription drug prices. What my bill does is reduce drug industry power and increase consumer power by subjecting the drug industry to the same competitive forces that other industries bear. It is a means of moderating prices that are too high without inadvertently setting prices too low.

Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place in the U.S. for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices as one example, legislation would establish product licensing for essential prescription drugs.

If a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no semblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug manufacturers to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic companies could sell competing products before the brand name expires, paying the patentholder royalties for that right. The patentholder would still be amply rewarded for being the first on the market, and Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices.

Alternatively, a drug company could lower voluntarily their price, which would preclude the Government from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, Madam Speaker, the price of prescription drugs would go down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited, detailed information on drug company expenses. Given that these companies are asking us to accept a status quo that has bankrupt seniors and fueled health care inflation, they have kept us guessing about their true cost for far too long.

We can continue to buy into drug industry threats that R&D will dry up unless we continue to shelter them from competition. That argument, however, Madam Speaker, falls apart when we look at how R&D is funded today.

Long story short, most of research and development dollars are provided by U.S. taxpayers. Get this: fifty percent of all the research and development for drug development in this country are paid for by taxpayers and the National Institutes of Health and other Federal and State agencies; and of the 50 percent that drug companies actually spend, they get tax deductions from Congress for that.

Yet, prescription drug companies reward American taxpayers by charging Americans consumers two times, three times, four times the price for prescription drugs that people in other countries pay.

Madam Speaker, we can do nothing in this body, or we can dare to challenge the drug industry on behalf of seniors and every health care consumer in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

#### REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP: LEAD BY EXAMPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I have introduced today a sense-of-Congress resolution. This sense-of-Congress resolution simply says that if we are going to engage in an across-the-board cut in all the Federal agencies, then Members of Congress should accept a similar cut in their salaries.

I would like to share the contents of my resolution:

"Whereas, Congress may pass an across-the-board funding reduction for Federal agencies to bring closure to the debate on Fiscal Year 2000 funding levels;

Whereas, lawmakers voted themselves a 3.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment this year;

Whereas, salaries of Members of Congress would not be affected by an across-the-board reduction;

Whereas, the rest of the Government's payroll would be affected by the proposed reduction, which would likely result in layoffs and temporary furloughs;

Whereas, it is estimated that the reductions could force layoffs of 39,000 military personnel; and

Whereas, programs at the Department of Education, Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services, programs such as Meals on Wheels, the National Institutes of Health, Head Start, and the Safe and Drug Free Schools program would be reduced.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that any across-the-board funding reduction for agencies in Fiscal Year 2000 should also include the same reduction for salaries of Members of Congress."

Why have I introduced this resolution? It is because a 1.4 percent reduction, as is being discussed, would lead to approximately 103,000 fewer women, infants, and children from benefiting from the food assistance and nutrition programs offered under the WIC program.

Title I, which provides educational benefits for disadvantaged students, would be cut by \$109 million. Head Start would be cut so that some 6,700 fewer children would be able to benefit from Head Start programs.

The Centers for Disease Control would be cut by approximately \$6.7 million. And a reduction of \$35.7 million would take place in the area of substance abuse and mental health services, thereby denying over 5,000 American citizens access to mental health treatment and drug abuse services.

Vital programs for our farming community would be cut by \$124 million. A 1.4 percent reduction would result in \$3.9 billion being cuts from defense. This cut would require that military services make cuts in recruiting and engage in force separations of up to 39,000 military personnel.

Madam Speaker, I think blanket cuts are unwise and unnecessary. But if the leadership of this House is intent on forcing such cuts indiscriminately on good programs as well as bad, then they ought to be willing to bear some of the burden themselves and take a pay cut.

It is unseemly for this Congress to ask the American people to tighten their belts while not doing the same itself. With this sense-of-Congress-resolution, I am simply asking that Members of Congress be consistent. If they really think it is wise to make blind cuts, then they should not be exempting their own salaries.

Quite frankly, I am sick and tired of the leadership up here treating themselves as special people while imposing hardships on ordinary Americans.

As we say in southern Ohio, what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

□ 2000

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

ON PASSING OF SENATOR CHAFEE

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by expressing my words of recognition and condolences to the family of Senator CHAFEE. He clearly distinguished the legislative branch of government with service that was bipartisan, common sense, moderate, centrist, and simply was a personal example of integrity and honesty and courage, the like of which some suggest we have too little of around here at this time. In any event, he set the bar very high and it would do well for all of us as we mourn his passing to reflect carefully on his example and embrace it in our own lives to the extent we can. Again, that would be a tall order. Senator CHAFEE in my last visit with him was leading a bipartisan discussion on how we might somehow form a breakthrough in a knotty health policy issue that had divided the parties, divided the Chambers. It was just one example I got to see up close and personal the kind of bipartisan, nonideological, let-us-solve-the-problem leadership that Senator CHAFEE brought to his work, and clearly the work of the legislative branch was distinguished as a result of his efforts.

Tonight, I am leading a special order about Social Security. In the course of